

April 8, 1975

The only time this \$110 comes into play, is when there is a worker that two-thirds of his salary or wages are more than 110. This limit cuts him down to 110. Anybody that two-thirds of their salary or wages are less than 110 are not affected by this maximum.

PRESIDENT: The question is the adoption of Senator Cavanaugh's amendment to Senator Kelly's amendment and I think that as Senator Kelly said, they're sort of rolled into one ball. Record your vote. Have you voted? Record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 9 nays, 15 not voting.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries. Senator Kelly, do you want to move the adoption of your amendment now?

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. President, I move that we adopt my amendment which would be \$110 maximum for workmans compensation, LB 198.

PRESIDENT: Record your vote. Have you voted? Record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 12 nays.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries. The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Now Mr. President, I move to indefinitely postpone 198. Signed, Senator Dworak.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: I think we've discussed the matter thoroughly. We've got a bill here that's changed its complexion so much from the time we started, from the time of the committee, from the time of the public hearing, that I think we've got something we don't even recognize from the way we started and I move that we indefinitely postpone the bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, specifically Senator Dworak, often when a piece of legislation is introduced it's like a piece of clay. It's formless, it's shapeless but it's the basic substance from which we refine and produce a piece of workable legislation. I think this bill is simple in terms of what it does. I believe it's understandable by everybody and many times you wind up with a finished product that looks nothing like what you started with. If that's the basis for this move to indefinitely postpone, I would suggest that Senator Dworak, instead of making this motion, simply read or ask somebody to read what has been done with the bill. If he's opposed to people who get injured on jobs, he ought to say so. But to plead ignorance to what this bill says now....Look, I was upstairs in my office, I heard some of the debate up there and missed some of it and I still think, I know what the bill says and does. So that's not a basis for indefinitely postponing this bill. A lot of the discussion dealt with the issues involved and the problems that people who get hurt on jobs, face. I think now it would be totally improper to destroy all of what has gone forth this afternoon. The bill has been hammered a great deal but apparently we've wound up with something that erstwhile opponents now agree on. So I suggest that we defeat